II. REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on February 22, 2006 (the "Office Action") rejected claim 17

under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite in its use of "appropriate" as a claim

term. The Office Action also rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 3,333,300 to Cohan, and further rejected that claim as obvious over the combination

of Cohan and U.S. Patent No. 1,909,135 to Syenson. In this Response, applicants present the

new claims as shown above, which the undersigned believes recite methods that are neither

shown nor suggested in those references.

It may be observed that claim 21 recites, among other things, "placing a core element

within a tubular mold section, where the core element is slightly larger in cross-section than the

workpiece, and the mold section has an inner dimension slightly smaller than the inner

dimension of the spindle;" The Cohan patent, on the other hand, being directed "to a mold

structure which provides a mold for making a roller, for example, on the rolling surface of which

there is no gate vestige or mold part line," makes no mention of core element dimensions in

relation to any workpiece, nor to a "mold section [that] has an inner dimension slightly smaller

than the inner dimension of [any] spindle" whatsoever. New claim 21, therefore, is neither

anticipated by nor obvious in light of the Cohan reference. Claim 31 also recites steps taken with

similar "core elements," and those steps are neither shown nor suggested by Cohan.

Furthermore, Svenson relates to spindles, not spindle liners, and further that Svenson neither

shows nor suggests a "core element" characterized as in the present claims 21 or 31. Because of

these missing elements, the rejections under §§ 102 and 103 do not apply to claims 21 or 31, nor

to any claim depending therefrom.

Mold and Method for Making a Unibody Lathe Spindle Liner Response to Office Action

Inventors: Joel C. TRUSTY et al.

7

The present Response is believed to put the application in condition for allowance, and

prompt action by the Office toward that end is respectfully requested. In the event any issue(s)

remain that may be resolved by telephone, the undersigned invites the Examiner to contact the

undersigned by telephone to expedite the examination of this application. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

/Matthew R. Schantz/

Matthew R. Schantz Attorney Reg. No. 40,800

BINGHAM McHALE, LLP

2700 Market Tower

10 West Market Street Indianapolis, IN 46204-4900

Telephone: (317) 635-8900

Facsimile: (317) 236-9907

mschantz@binghammchale.com

11111-43236/1057671

Filed: July 28, 2003 Inventors: Joel C. TRUSTY et al.

App. No. 10/628,593

8